

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1, 3-8, 10, 11, 13, 23 and 25-28 are now pending in this application. Claims 1 and 23 are independent claims. Claims 1 and 23 have been amended. Claims 2, 9, 12, 14-22, 24 and 29-31 have been cancelled.

Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 103(a)

Claims 1, 3-8, 10, 13, 23 and 25 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Idleman et al., United States Patent Number: 5,274,645 (hereinafter: Idleman), in view of Weng, United States Patent Number: 5,265,104 (hereinafter: Weng). (Pending Office Action, Page 4). Claims 11 and 26-28 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Idleman and Weng, in view of Iwatani, United States Patent Number: 6,023,780 (hereinafter: Iwatani). (Pending Office Action, Page 4). Applicant respectfully traverses these rejections.

“To establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness, three basic criteria must be met. First, there must be some suggestion or motivation, either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art, to modify the reference or to combine reference teachings. Second, there must be a reasonable expectation of success. Finally, the prior art reference (or references when combined) must teach or suggest all the claim limitations.” (emphasis added) (MPEP § 2143). “If an independent claim is non-obvious under 35 U.S.C. 103, then any claim depending therefrom is non-obvious.” (emphasis added) *In re Fine*, 837 F. 2d 1071, 5USPQ2d 1596 (Fed. Cir. 1988). Applicant respectfully submits that independent Claims 1 and 23 include elements that are not disclosed, taught or suggested by any of the references cited by the Patent Office, either alone or in combination.

Independent Claims 1 and 23 of the present invention each generally recite a system/method wherein:

“wherein the cyclic redundancy check is generated and managed at a sector level and the cyclic redundancy check metadata is the only metadata managed.”

In the present invention, cyclic redundancy check (CRC) is generated and managed at a sector level. (Present Application, Page 6, Paragraph 0021 and Page 8,

Paragraph 0032). Further, in the present invention, CRC is the only metadata managed. (Present Application, Page 6, Paragraph 0019). With CRC being the sole means for providing drive anomaly and data path integrity protection, the present invention promotes increased flexibility in that metadata management is not dictated by cache block size of a storage controller. (Present Application, Page 5, Paragraph 0015 and Page 6, Paragraph 0021). Thus, with the present invention, metadata management may be more controller-independent, such that if a storage controller's cache block size is changed, there is no need to reformat data on all of the disk drives. (Present Application, Page 6, Paragraphs 0019 and 0021).

Based on the rationale above, Applicant contends that none of the references cited by the Patent Office against the present invention, either alone or in combination, teach, disclose or suggest the above-referenced elements as claimed in Claims 1 and 23 of the present application and therefore, the above-cited references do not preclude patentability of the present invention under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a). Applicant further contends that given the advantages provided by the present invention, it would not have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the present invention to combine or modify any of the above-cited references to arrive at the present invention as claimed. As a result, a *prima facie* case of obviousness has not been established for independent Claims 1 and 23. Thus, independent Claims 1 and 23 are believed allowable. Further, Claims 3-8, 10, 11 and 13 (which depend from Claim 1) and Claims 25-28 (which depend from Claim 23) are therefore allowable.

CONCLUSION

In light of the forgoing, reconsideration and allowance of the pending claims is earnestly solicited.

Appl. No. 10/066,270

Amendment & Response to Final Office Action dated 08-15-06

Respectfully submitted on behalf of

LSI Logic,

By: 

Jeffrey M. Andersen

Reg. No. 52,558

Dated: October 13, 2006

Jeffrey M. Andersen

SUITER • SWANTZ PC LLO

14301 FNB Parkway, Suite 220

Omaha, NE 68154

(402) 496-0300

telephone

(402) 496-0333

facsimile